DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 682 CG 011 503

AUTHOR Milor, Charles A.
TITLE Becoming a Marijuana Dealer. Criminal Justice Monograph, Volume VII, No. 3.
INSTITUTION Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 20p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; *Drug Abuse; *Marihuana; Moral Issues; *Personality; Research Projects; Social Influences; *Socially Deviant Behavior; *Social Problems; Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

This study presents an analysis of the process of becoming a marijuana dealer. It is only through an understanding of this process that the problem of marijuana can be completely understood. The process of becoming a dealer is seen as a process consisting of two parts: (1) the development of the external relationships which allow entrance into the marijuana-using groups; and (2) the rationalizing of the internal norms and goals of the larger society to those of a marijuana dealer. The social controls of society that prohibit marijuana use are outlined, and focus of the study is directed at the social processes that take place in the development of a dealer. There could be a pre-disposition in the personality of the people who become dealers, but unless this potential is subjected to the processes described in this paper, the potential will never be realized. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141682

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Vol. VII, No. 3
1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Becoming A Marijuana Dealer

Charles A. Milor

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONOGRAPH

Vol. VII, No. 3

Becoming A Marijuana Dealer

Charles A. Milor

INSTITUTE OF CONTEMPORARY CORRECTIONS
AND THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Huntsville, Texas 77340

3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1
History of Marijuana in the World 1
History in the United States 1

II. METHODOLOGY 7

III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY 17

APPENDIX 19

INTRODUCTION

Cannabis has been used for thousands of years, over almost all the world, for the value of its fibers and as an intoxicant. **Cannabis** was grown by the Jamestown colonists for fibers, which were used to make rope, clothing and sails for ships (**The Consumer's Union Report of Licit and Illicit Drugs**). **Cannabis** has been heralded both as the cause of all of society's problems as well as the cure of society's ills. **Cannabis,** or marijuana, has been used as an intoxicant in the United States for at least the last seventy-five years. Marijuana became a social issue in the late 1920's and 30's and reappeared as a major social problem over the last decade and a half. There has been a myriad of materials written by both opponents and advocates of marijuana. The two things upon which opponents and advocates alike agree is that there has been a dramatic increase in the use of marijuana and that marijuana use has moved out of the ghetto and into the homes of middle-class Americans. As is indicated in the findings of Goode in **The Marijuana Smokers,**

> It could be that one hundred times as much marijuana in bulk is consumed now in comparison with ten years ago, but whether our estimates are considerably larger or smaller than this, tons of this drug move about the country in some orderly fashion.[1]

The problem to be explored is that over the last decade, marijuana has moved out of the Barrios, ghettos, and port cities and into the hands of the young middle-class. Many young middle-class males have become heavily involved in the dealing of marijuana. The importance of this study lies in the need for a theory that purports to explain how a person becomes a marijuana dealer. The dealer plays a major role in the marijuana scene, yet, there has been little research into the process of becoming a marijuana dealer. The purpose of this study is to outline the social and personal factors which contribute to a person's becoming a marijuana dealer.

History of Marijuana in the World

Marijuana is the North American name for **Cannabis Sativa.** The plant is known by a multitude of both slang and proper names. There is great difficulty in tracing the origins of marijuana through history. As in all controversial subjects, there is a great deal of myth that surrounds the subject. Additionally, in many places the use of marijuana preceded the written word. **Cannabis** has a long history of use both for its fibers, which are used to make rope, and for its intoxicating effects.

> The first record of Cannabis in China is to be found in the **Herbal,** an ancient equivalent to the U.S. **Pharmacopies,** and was written about four hundred to five hundred B.C. The first known reference to marijuana in India is to be found in the **Alharna Vedo,** which may date as far back as the second millenium [B.C.].[2]

According to **Consumer's Report,** "The date on which marijuana was introduced into western Europe is not known, but it must have been very early. An urn containing marijuana leaves and seeds was unearthed near Berlin, Germany. It is believed to date from 500 B.C."[3]

> In the United States, the traditional way of using marijuana is to smoke it in a cigarette. In India, 'three separate grades of marijuana products have been traditionally recognized: (1) Bhang, a weak preparation of the leaves and flowering tops of the plant, roughly comparable to the marijuana grown and harvested in the United States; (2) Ganja, a significantly stronger preparation, which includes some of the potent resin as well as the leaves and flowering tops is roughly comparable to the potent marijuana imported into the United States from Mexico and Viet Nam; (3) Charas, the highly potent resin in pure or almost pure form, is the product known in the United States and elsewhere as hashish, or hash. Bhang and Ganja are used primarily by the lower classes in India, those that cannot afford alcohol. The two stronger forms are smoked as marijuana is smoked in the United States. The weakest, Bhang, is customarily eaten or drunk in a variety of forms'.[4]

History in the United States

According to the National Commission on Marijuana, marijuana was brought to America probably by Spaniards or their black slaves sometime around the sixteenth century. The colonists inherited hemp from England.

> America's early relations with hemp were a compulsory inheritance from the mother country. England had long relied on the hemp plant for a number of important items: windmill and ship sails, fine napkins, sheets and altar cloths. The first American crop of Indian hemp was planted in 1611.[5]
>
> The Civil War discouraged the industry beyond all hope of resuscitation. Union embargoes of southern ports caused a crisis in southern cotton

---

[1]Erich Goode, **The Marijuana Smokers** (New York-London Basic Books, Inc., 1970), p. 13.
[2]**Consumer's Report on Licit and Illicit Drugs,** p. 397.
[3]**Ibid.**
[4]**Ibid.,** p. 398.
[5]Lester Grinspoon, M.D., **Marijuana Reconsidered** (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971), p. 11.

> production. Because hemp production had come to be used heavily in the cotton bailing process, the decrease in cotton production indirectly curtailed hemp production. Also, the industry's labor supply disappeared with the freeing of the slaves. Finally, with the rapid decline of the building of sailing ships and the introduction of Phillipine Island hemp, the industry entered a slump from which it never recovered.[6]

Marijuana, as used as an intoxicant, first began to appear in the United States around the turn of the twentieth century. The National Commission gives various groups of people the dubious honor for the spread of its use. These include American soldiers who were stationed in the Canal Zone, those who fought Pancho Villa in Mexico, and the Mexican laborers. According to the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse,

> Cannabis use was prevalent in Mexico by 1898. It was widely cultivated and growing wild. The drug was readily available for eating, drinking, or smoking, the latter being by far the most common method of ingestion. Soldiers in Pancho Villa's army are reputed to have used the drug freely.[7]

Marijuana use began to move northward. In 1914, the city of El Paso, Texas, enacted a city ordinance banning sale and possession of marijuana. As the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse has said,

> After an official request by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Treasury issued a decision under the Food and Drug Act prohibiting importation of Cannabis after 1915 for other than medical purposes.[8]

The use of marijuana, according to the National Commission,

> was given an added push with the enactment of the Eighteenth Amendment. However, marijuana did not become a real issue until the fall of 1926 when the New Orleans **Tribune** and the **Morning Item** began to run articles attacking marijuana as the enslaver of school children.[9]

By the 1930's, marijuana had begun to move out of the port towns and into the interior of America. In 1930, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was established. The founding of the Bureau has done more to influence the attitude of the public towards marijuana than any other source. By 1937, forty-six of the forty-eight states had laws against the use of marijuana. Much of the credit for this legislation can be given to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and to its director, Harry J. Anslinger, who was the head of a newspaper and magazine campaign to bring marijuana under the control of the newly established Federal Bureau of Narcotics. Commissioner Anslinger made speeches and contributed articles to his journal. The most influential of his efforts was **Marijuana—Assassin of Youth**.[10]

As exemplified in the following quotation, the efforts to increase public awareness of the marijuana problem have received much attention.

> Professor Howard S. Becker, a sociologist now at Northwestern University, had documented in detail the magazine phase of this campaign. Professor Becker's notes in **The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature,** failed to list a single article on marijuana from January, 1925, through June, 1935. Four such national magazine articles, however, were indexed for the period July, 1935, through June, 1937, and seventeen more were indexed between July, 1937, and June, 1939. The production of anti-marijuana articles then tapered off again to four between 1939 and June, 1941, with one long article indexed in the period July, 1941, to June, 1943. Of the seventeen articles during the peak of the drive, Professor Becker continues, 'Ten either explicitly acknowledged the help of the Bureau in furnishing facts and figures or gave implicit evidence of having received help by using facts and figures that had appeared earlier, either in Bureau publications or in testimony before Congress'.[11]

In 1937, the marijuana tax act was passed in Congress with little opposition. The Bill's purpose was to allow the Federal Covernment, meaning the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, to control cultivation, transportation, and use of marijuana. The marijuana question faded out until the 1960's when it once again surfaced as a national issue. This time the outbreak took on new aspects. "Pot" (marijuana) became a symbol of social change. Pot became intertwined into the new young left philosophy.

The sixties were a time of social unrest and social change. The symbol of this unrest may have been the marijuana question. Marijuana, to a large portion of our population, represents a threat to the values of our society. This is indicated in the statement which follows: "Today a great part of the objection to marijuana use is not based upon any effect of the drug, but rather upon the entire lifestyle that many associate with it."[12] The use of marijuana was an affront to the societal values concerning responsibility, radicalism, permissiveness, and authority.

When marijuana was just becoming a middle-class

[6]**Ibid.**, p. 12.

[7]**National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse,** Vol. I, 1972, pp. 481-82.

[8]**Ibid.**, p. 482.

[9]**Ibid.**, p. 483.

[10]**Ibid.**, p. 489.

[11]**Consumer's Report,** p. 414.

[12]John Kaplan, **Marijuana—The New Prohibition** (The World Publishing Company, 1970), p. 4.

phenomenon, around the beginning of the sixties, the first middle class users of the drug tended to be far more radical politically than their fellows, perhaps because they were so alienated from society that they could ignore one of society's most severe criminal laws. And though, as marijuana use became more widespread, the ranks of the users have come to include every political persuasion, it is still true that on the average, middle-class marijuana users are more likely to have no formal religion and to come from wealthy and better educated families.[13]

Who is the marijuana smoker? How does he become a marijuana user? What kind of person is he? These questions have been asked for many years by American society. The answer to these questions has changed. Forty years ago, marijuana was used mainly by Mexican farm laborers, soldiers, and sailors who had access to foreign ports and countries. Today in 1975, the use has spread and encompasses vast segments of our society, from the doctor or lawyer who is an occasional user to the hippie who uses the intoxicant several times daily (National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse). Many times, the only apparent similarity between users is marijuana use. In short, there is no longer a typical marijuana user. However, there are some generalizations that hold true as is evidenced in Table 1, which is based upon a study by Goode and EVO (East Village Others). The user is more likely to be young.

TABLE 1

Age Range in Goode and EVO Studies*

Goode	Percent	EVO	Percent
17 or under	5	16 or under	4
18 or 19	16	17 or 18	11
20 or 21	25	19, 20, 21	28
22, 23, 24, 25	30	22, 23, 24, 25	35
26, 27, 28, 29	18	26 to 30	12
30 or over	7	30 or over	10

Age Range in New York Med College Study

Age	Percent
Teens	22
Twenties	70
Thirties	8

*Source: Eric Goode, **The Marijuana Smokers** (New York-London Basic Books, Inc., 1970)

Goode and the EVO study found that 90 per cent of the users were under the age of thirty.

[13]**Ibid.**

[14]National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Table 42, p. 290.

The user is more likely to be male. As is true with all addicting drugs, the male is not only more likely to use marijuana, he is more likely to be a heavy user and be more involved in the whole drug scene. The President's Commission on Marijuana found that among adults eighteen years of age and older, 21 per cent were men as compared to 10 per cent who were women that tried marijuana.

Race does not seem to be related to marijuana use in the United States. The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug, Alcohol, and Beverages found that on their national survey of respondents eighteen years of age and older, 15 per cent of the white and 14 per cent of the blacks had had experience with marijuana. Five per cent of whites and three per cent of blacks are present users. Due to the white's larger proportion in the population, there are more white users. The marijuana smoker is more likely to live in or near a large city[14] as illustrated in Table 2.

The class background of the marijuana smoker is usually higher than that of the non-smoker. To a limited extent, we can say that

> ...the higher the income of one's family, the higher the education of one's parents, the greater the prestige of one's occupation, the greater is the likelihood of smoking marijuana. Students from the wealthiest families with incomes of over $25,000 per year report the greatest drug experience for all drugs with the slight exception of special substances where one percent more from families in the $15,000 to $25,000 bracket report experience of opiates, where all income brackets are about the same, ranging from one percent to two percent. Nevertheless, the lowest income bracket, under $5,000 is highest on opiates, its 2.38 percent use being one percent higher than any other, which is, in relative terms, twice as great.[15]

TABLE 2

Type of Community and Marijuana Use—Florida High School Seniors*

Community	Percentage of Marijuana Users
Large City (250,000)	17%
Medium City (25,000)	14%
Small City (under 25,000)	9%
Rural City	8%

*Sources: National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Table 42, p. 290.
Erich Goode, **The Marijuana Smokers** (New York-London: Basic Books, Inc., 1970), p. 35.

[15]Richard H. Blum, **Students and Drugs** (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), p. 66.

Table 3 illustrates the relationship between marijuana experience and family income.

There have been several studies to determine the correlation between alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana use. In Blum's 1966-67 study of drug use on five campuses, significant and positive correlations were found between the use of alcohol, cigarettes and all dangerous drugs.[16] The strength of these relationships varied. Some were much more substantial than others, but all were statistically significant.[17]

TABLE 3

Relationship Between Marijuana Experience and Family Income*

(Adults (N=2,405)

Income (Family)	Ever Used	Use Now
$4,000 or less	12*	4*
$5,000-$9,999	16*	4*
$10,000-$14,999	17*	4*
$15,000-$24,999	18*	5*
$25,000 or more	15*	7*

*Sources: Erich Goode, **The Marijuana Smokers,** (New York-London, Basic Books, Inc., 1970), Table 2-4, p. 37.
National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Vol. I, 1972, p. 295.

The how and why of a person becoming a marijuana user or dealer is a perplexing question. Social scientists have used basically four methods to obtain a theory that purports to explain this deviant behavior. They are:

> (1)The use of autobiographical material to conceptualize deviant motivation. The goal here is to show motives, goals and values of the deviant.
>
> (2)The use of the psychoanalytic categories. This method says that the deviance is inherent in the personality of the deviant.
>
> (3)The use of analytic sociological concepts. This theory says that the deviance is caused by sociological conditions (Merton, Parsons).
>
> (4)Labeling perspective. This attempts to ascertain the structural or situational features of deviant behavior, rather than the motivational features; but instead of analytic concepts and variables derived from or imposed upon statistical data, its tools are naturalistic descriptive data and observation.
>
> The focus is on the process of the deviant behavior, the interaction between situational demands which are products of the larger social structure and the individual who must confront these demands.[18]

Labeling theory was first used by Alfred R. Lindersmith in his study of opiate addiction. Lindersmith used the analytic induction method to develop a theory that explained the sequences of events which constituted becoming an addict. Howard S. Becker used labeling theory in his study on becoming a marijuana user. Becker found that in time, deviant behavior caused deviant motivation. A person usually tries marijuana in a social surrounding where marijuana is available and norms against its use were neutralized inside the group. The first step in the sequence is that he must learn to use the proper smoking technique so that his conception of it can change. Next, the smoker must learn to perceive the "high." He then learns to view marijuana in a pleasurable light. Once the person has learned to view marijuana as pleasurable he learns to neutralize the social controls against its use, according to Becker.

> The major kinds of controls to be considered are (a) control through limiting the supply and access to the drug; (b) control through the necessity of keeping non-users from discovering that one is a user; (c) control through definition of the act is immoral. The rendering ineffective of these controls, at the levels and in the combinations to be described, may be taken as an essential condition for continued and increased marijuana use.[19]

According to the Becker study of the marijuana user, the career of a marijuana user can be divided into three stages: (1) the beginner person who smokes for the first time; (2) the occasional user whose use is sporadic and dependent on chance factors; and (3) the regular user to whom use is a regular routine. For a user to progress from one stage of use to another, it is necessary that he overcome the social control. Because marijuana is illegal, a person must be in the "know" to a certain extent to have access to the drug. The beginner and occasional user usually obtains marijuana from friends and seldom buys a personal supply. If the occasional user wants to become a regular user, he must find a regular supply rather than depend on chance encounters. To do this, a person must become more acquainted with people who use marijuana on a regular basis. The marijuana user is faced with the problem of secrecy. The fear of losing the respect of non-using friends and parents is also a factor. "In short, persons limit their use of marijuana in proportion to the degree of their fear, realistic or other wise, that non-users who are important to them will discover they use drugs and react in some punishing way."[20]

[16]Richard H. Blum and Associates, **The Dream Sellers**, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 128.

[17]National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, Vol. I, 1972, p. 298.

[18]James T. Carey, **The College Drug Scene**, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), p. 6.

[19]Howard S. Becker, **Outsiders**, (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 61-62.

[20]**Ibid.**, p. 72.

Morality

The user is faced with the morality of use. The stereotype of a "dope addict" violates the Christian work ethic. As Becker says,

> In short, a person will feel free to use marijuana to the degree that he comes to regard conventional conceptions of it as the uninformed views of outsiders and replaces those conceptions with the 'inside' view he has acquired through his experience with the drug in the company of others.
>
> Most of the marijuana that comes into this country originates in Mexico. Of the estimated 1,501,700 kilograms of crude marijuana consumed annually in this country, ninety percent (1,351,500) originates outside the United States market: adding 1,481,500 kilograms or 1,899,400 short kilograms. The land required to produce this amount is about 7,600 acres.[21]

In Mexico, it is grown in the states of Guerrero, Michoacan, Marjaril, Sonoma, Yucatan, Oaxaca and Jalisco. Marijuana is harvested twice yearly, in April and October. It is then sold in kilogram bricks out of the fields, usually in bulk amounts out of the field. It is taken by truck to the border where the price goes up to $35.00 to $40.00 per kilogram. Due to the bulk of marijuana, it must be broken up into smaller lots of not more than three hundred kilos. In 1969, the mean weight of the 2,673 marijuana seizures made by customs was less than ten kilograms.[22]

Blum estimates that four tons of marijuana must cross the border a day. Because of the bulk, and no way to control the market, marijuana has not seemed to attract organized crime. There seems to be a large number of users who make a relatively small profit by selling marijuana, according to the President's Commission on Marijuana.

People who sell marijuana can be divided up into several groups. The importer makes contacts inside Mexico to smuggle marijuana across the border. These people take the largest risk. They must have contacts in or near Mexico, and they must be able to put together large sums of money. The importer sells in large lots of marijuana to the dealers on the United States side of the border. Dealers in the United States differ in frequency of their deals and in the size of the deals. Most importers have several steady large dealers that they can depend on to unload their smuggled marijuana. These dealers may be a regular customer who sells on a regular basis, or they may be a sporadic dealer who deals only when he has extra money. These dealers may buy various amounts anywhere from ten pounds up. They stand to make approximately 20 per cent to 35 per cent profit on their investment. The small dealer buys from the larger dealer, who sells him around ten pound lots. These small dealers have several street pushers that they can sell to in approximately three pound lots. These three pound lots are then broken into lids or ounces and are sold to the user. On paper, there seems to be a lot of money to be made in dealing marijuana, but, in actuality, to make money, the dealer has to invest money which few dealers have. He also has to become acquainted with the drug scene. He has to establish contacts both to buy and to sell. In doing this, he many times attracts the attention of the police and once this happens, his time in the business is limited.

[21]**Ibid.**

[22]National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, p. 602.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to discover how a person becomes a marijuana dealer. The object of the research was to develop through analytical induction a hypothesis that outlines the social and personal factors that contribute to a person who is a marijuana user becoming a marijuana dealer.

The method that was used in this study to develop the hypothesis will be analytical induction. This method is suited to the problem to be studied because, as stated by Robinson,

> (1) it makes it possible to test one theory against another; (2) it provides the possibility of cumulative growth as old theories are revised to take into account negative evidence; and (3) it makes for close articulation of theories and facts.[23]

The first step in the analytic induction method is to develop an exploratory hypothesis and a definition of the problem to be explained (see Figure 1).

In Figure 1 the four square box figure is the basic example of the proposed experimental design. P equals the phenomenon of marijuana dealing; P is defined as marijuana use without dealing; C equals the conditions necessary for a marijuana user to become a marijuana dealer; and C equals some, but not all, of the conditions necessary to deal—this will be the dealers that the hypothesis does not explain. The goal will be to have all of the lower left hand column moved either to the right side or to the upper left.

Proposed Experimental Design

P = Marijuana Dealers
P = Marijuana Users
C = Conditions to Deal
C = Conditions Not Present to Deal

	P	P
C	X	?
C	O	X

Figure 1

The problem is studied and the facts that are obtained from the study are compared with the hypothesis. Then either the hypothesis is altered or the problem is redefined. The analytical method has been used in the past by researchers studying similar problems: Sutherland, in his study of crime; Cressey's study of embezzlement; Lindersmith's study of opiate addiction; and in Becker's study of marijuana use, to name several. This study will use the same method as did Becker, Lindersmith, Cressey, and Sutherland, with the exception that instances where the phenomenon that does not occur will be studied as well as where it does occur. The sample where the phenomenon occurs will be the main source of information; the sample where it does not occur will be used to test the hypothesis that was derived from the sample of marijuana dealers. The major criticism of Lindersmith and Cressey has been that they only studied samples where the phenomenon occurred. The two sample populations to be studied will consist of (1) thirty white males who use marijuana on a regular basis, and (2) thirty white males who are wholesale marijuana dealers. A marijuana non-dealer user will be defined as a person who uses marijuana on a regular basis of at least three times a week and does not sell marijuana for profit. A user dealer is defined as someone who uses marijuana on a regular basis of at least three times a week and who sells marijuana on a wholesale basis of at least three pound lots, or as someone who makes a substantial part of his income from marijuana sales. The second sample population consisted of thirty males who use marijuana on a regular basis and have access to marijuana but do not sell it for profit.

Information was obtained from the sample populations by a two-fold method. First, the respondent was interviewed with scheduled open-ended questions. Then the respondent was observed in discussion with other respondents. Before each interview, the respondent was shown a copy of the questions that were to be asked. This was done to alleviate his fears of self-incrimination and to facilitate trust between the respondent and the interviewer. The respondent was then asked if he would allow the interview to be recorded. The tape machine was cut off during all informal conversation. If the respondent allowed the tape machine, the respondent was shown how to operate it and had the option to turn it on or off at any time. The dealers were asked approximately fifty questions. The questions were continually revised as the hypothesis itself was revised (See Appendix A for list of questions).

Data

The data on which this study is based were derived from interviews and observational material gathered during five months of observation of the marijuana scene. The author took the role of an observer. The author was accepted into the confidence of the users and dealers because he was introduced by trusted members of the groups he observed and by his appearance (twenty-three years of age, long hair, and dressed in blue jeans), and by the author's use and knowledge of slang terms, associated with the use of marijuana.

The author kept notes on all conversations. These notes were transcribed at later dates with the help of an associate who helped recall the conversations. In all, sixty dealers and users consented to be a part of the study. However, around a hundred people were observed and

[23]W S. Robinson, "The Logical Structure of Analytic Induction," **American Sociological Review**, p. 812.

upon whose behavior notes were taken. Many times it was not necessary to tell the persons that they were being interviewed because of the informal nature of the interview. It should be noted, however, that all of the sixty who constitute the total population were aware of and did give their consent to participation in the study. This method seemed to extract the most information from the respondents, although, it was a much more lengthy process than a regular interview. The interviews were usually carried out in the residence of the respondents, although several interviews were done in bars and cafes. Some respondents were observed over a relatively short period of time. Others were observed over a several month period.

Generation of Questions

The first set of questions were compiled in a three-fold manner: (1) from reviews of the existing literature; (2) from conversations with and observations of people involved with marijuana; and (3) criminological theory. The questions were then arranged to take into consideration existing information as it was discovered. The first hypothesis to explain dealing was that people begin to deal because their routes to success were blocked. Even though they were not considered from the lower class, they would be unable to maintain a standard of living equal to that of their peers. The questions were asked in the form of a scheduled interview. The researcher tried to direct the interview according to that schedule, but due to the informal setting of the interviews, this was impossible. Each respondent was questioned informally as to the extent of his involvement with marijuana and his willingness to share information. All dealers that were approached by the interviewer gave their permission to be interviewed and to have the interview recorded on tape. Several dealers or users were approached by a third party who asked if they would care to respond. They declined for reasons unknown. Out of the thirty users approached, seven refused to respond at all. Ten of those users responding refused to respond at all. Ten of those users responding refused to be recorded, as illustrated in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Willingness of Marijuana Dealers and Users to Give Information

	Declined to be Interviewed	Declined Recording	Recorded and Interviewed	Total
Users	7	10	20	37(100%)
Dealers	0	0	30	30(100%)

$X^2=38.0$ DF=2 $P \leq .001$ N=67

In order to test for significance of differences between the two sample populations, the null hypothesis was stated as follows: There are no differences between the dealers of marijuana and the users of marijuana with reference to willingness to give information about the activity in question. Since $P \leq .001$ the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of an alternative hypothesis which is stated as follows: There is a difference between the dealers of marijuana and users of marijuana with reference to willingness to give information about the activity in question. The disparity in observed and expected frequency is noteworthy. The observed frequency for the non-users who declined to be interviewed is 7, and the expected frequency was 3.8; therefore, it can be noted that almost twice as many users declined to be interviewed informally as was expected.

For the dealers, the observed was 0 and the expected was 3.1. It is therefore inferred that users are more reluctant to give information because of a failure to normalize social controls. The observed frequency of users who declined to be recorded was 10. Since the observed frequency is so much higher than the expected of 5.5, it supports the previous data that users have not normalized social controls to the extent of the dealers. The observed frequency of dealers who declined to be recorded was 0, the expected was 3.1. The users who were recorded had an observed frequency of 30; the expected was 13.4 These disparities between observed and expected frequency, along with the information obtained through interviews and observations, point out the differences of perceptions of social controls between the user and the dealer. The users were more nervous and reluctant to discuss their involvement with marijuana. It is suggested that dealers have normalized the social controls and they were therefore more open to approach by the researcher.

The first questions asked to each group were concerning **their parent's income and if their parent's income was equal to the income of their peer's parents** (see Table 5). All respondents from both sample populations came from lower-middle and upper-middle class families.

TABLE 5

Marijuana Dealers' and Users' Perceptions of Parent's Income as Related to Income of Peer's Parents

	Equal to Peer's Parents	Not Equal to Peer's Parents
Dealers	17	13
Users	24	6

This question was asked to find out if the dealers might have been motivated by lack of money and if the dealers were trying to resolve this through dealing. The dealers answered the question as follows: Thirteen felt that they had had a little less material things than their friends. Twenty-four of the user non-dealers responded that they felt they had had as much or more than their friends.

In order to test the relatedness of perception of parental income to use and dealing, the following null hypothesis was formulated: The income of marijuana

dealers' parents will be less than the income of their peers' parents.

If P≤ .05 reject the null hypothesis in favor of an alternative hypothesis that there is not a difference in parent's income. These data seem to show that dealers' families are as financially stable as the families of non-dealers.

The dealers were asked a series of questions on their **financial expectations** for the future. On this question, there were two distinct answers. The larger amounts the dealers handled, regardless of conventional job skills, the larger they expected their incomes to be in ten years. Dealers who dealt in twenty pound lots or more seemed to be the break-off point between the ambitious and the less ambitious. Out of the eight large dealers interviewed, the average expected income was over fifty thousand dollars. Of the eight large dealers, two have college degrees, four have two years of college, one is a college student, and one is a high school graduate. In the way of job skills, only four had any job experience other than that of manual, unskilled labor. Four had managerial experience in business. The remaining twenty-two dealers were more conventionally oriented. Ten were still in college working towards degrees. Four were managing small businesses. Six were working unskilled jobs. One was a salesman, and one was an electrician (see Table 6). When asked what they thought their income would be in ten years, eleven said middle-class, and one did not have any idea.

TABLE 6

Occupations of Marijuana Users and Marijuana Dealers

	Users	Large Dealers	Middle-Range Dealers
College Students	14	1	10
Small Business	4	2	4
Salesmen	2	1	1
Unemployed	2	2	0
Construction Work	8	2	7
	N=30	N=8	N=22

Of the users non-dealers, the expected income was closer to conventional standards. Twenty-three responded with an average of seventeen thousand dollars. The seven users who did not respond were artists and writers who had no way of judging their future income. Of the thirty users who responded, two were law students, six were college graduates, twelve were college students, and three were working with two years of college (refer to Table 7).

TABLE 7

Educational Levels of Marijuana Users and Marijuana Dealers Responding

	Users	Large Dealers	Middle-Range Dealers
College Graduate	10	2	8
Graduate Student	2	0	0
College Student	12	0	10
Two years college or less	6	5	2
High School Diploma	0	0	2
	N=30	N=8	N=22

The process of becoming a marijuana dealer is a two-fold process: (1) the actual physical process that takes place, and (2) the socialization into the role of a dealer. This socialization takes place as a user exchanges his conventional values and norms for values and norms of a drug subculture. Becoming a marijuana dealer is actually an extension of the process Becker describes in his study of becoming a marijuana user and marijuana use and social control. The theory starts at the point where a person has become a regular marijuana user. All dealers interviewed were heavy marijuana users prior to becoming a dealer. At this point the users had rationalized their conventional concepts regarding marijuana use, yet had not acquired new concepts regarding sale and the role of a dealer.

As the occasional user becomes a heavy user, he meets more people who are involved in the marijuana scene. These connections expose him to the norms and values of this group. Because of their heavy use they were forced to make more buys than the occasional user. Marijuana is sold only in fixed amounts, such as one ounce, one pound, or multiples thereof. The heavy user is faced with the situation of making several buys a week of one ounce bags or to make one buy of a pound. The user has sixty per cent more marijuana for the same price if he buys a pound instead of an ounce. This way he does not have to make several buys and is saved the hassle and the risk by cutting down his involvement. The dealers, when asked if money was the reason for the first sale, replied,

No, at first I just wanted to get good pot any time I

wanted it and maybe turn my friends on to a good deal. Money never entered the picture. It was a lot of fun at first.

Another dealer expressed himself as follows:

> No, at first it wasn't to make money. It was to keep from spending it. I had a lot of friends who got high and knew I got high. Whenever I had pot it seemed my friends would be out, so when I bought a lid for ten dollars, it was gone. I never had a hundred bucks to blow on a pound, so I got a friend to front me a pound and I sold my friends ten dollar lids, paid back my friend, and had eight ounces left over for free. I sold a few more and did the same thing again. That way my friends had pot and I had pot and everyone was happy.

To buy a pound the user will need around one hundred dollars. He will then have an excess of marijuana in his possession. The heavy user will have requests from friends to purchase small amounts of marijuana or for loans. All dealers interviewed began selling in small amounts to cover the expense of their larger buys. A typical answer follows:

> We was smoking a lot of pot so me and Jimmy decided to cop a pound and sell a few lids to pay for a pound. We weren't interested in making no bucks so we made real big lids. Man, those lids went like hotcakes. People were calling the house. I had to beat my parents to the phone.

It is at this point that profit becomes a significant factor. It may take a user several weeks or several years to arrive at this point. The actual selling to friends as favors has expanded past the giving (or lending) of marijuana to members of the circle of immediate friends. One full-time dealer, when asked when money became important, responded as follows:

> That's hard to say. I was smoking a lot so I used to go in with a friend and get a pound. We would split it up and sell three or four lids to pay for the cost. I sold to friends and gave them good deals. Then friends of friends wanted to buy so as long as I was taking the risk I just as well make the money.

All dealers told of similar experiences. As the user becomes more involved in marijuana, his values concerning dealing begin to change. The beginner and occasional user both have limited access to marijuana, but as their involvement increases, so does their knowledge. The dealers were asked if they would have been able to make a large buy when they first began to smoke. Twenty-seven replied that they would not have known where to buy a large amount. Three replied they would have, but after further questioning replied that they would not have known anyone to sell a large amount to.

The actual selling to friends, which the user did not consider as dealing (and which is not considered selling for purposes of this study), supplied the motivation for the user to become a dealer. The laws prohibiting marijuana and the economic considerations play a major role in the making of a dealer. This finding supports Carey's findings.[24] It seems logical to infer that the dealer who sells small amounts is the most likely to be apprehended by the police because his volume of sales causes a high visibility. The dealer who sells small amounts is guilty of the same crime as the large dealer in that the legal sanctions are the same. The dealers interviewed when questioned as to why they sold large amounts, replied:

> I sold lids for awhile but I always had people calling and coming by. I was having to drive all over town. Just to make a sixty dollar profit, I had to sell sixteen lids to sixteen people, which is a real hassle. I met this guy who said he could get me three pounds for seventy-five a piece. I already had them sold for a hundred dollars each, so I mad seventy-five dollars real quick with a lot less hassle.

Another dealer expressed himself in this way,

> I had been selling lids for awhile in Florida when this friend of mine called from Texas. He said he could get ten pounds for sixty a piece. He asked me if I could help him get rid of them for half the profit. I thought, 'what the hell, selling a lid's a felony, I might as well make some money if I'm going to take the risk, so I got some friends to ask around and we had them sold for a hundred each. We both made a nice profit with little hassle on my part.

In short, none of the dealers observed started dealing with the intention of making profits or with the intention of becoming a dealer. All began to sell as a convenience to themselves and only gradually came to realize the economic benefits.

TABLE 8

Comparison of Marijuana Users with Dealers in Conceptions of Marijuana Dealing Prior to Involvement with Marijuana in Percentage

	Postive		Negative	
	N	%	N	%
Users	0	0	30	100
Dealers	1	3	29	97

$X^2 = 6.304$ df = 6.304 $P \leq .02$

In order to test whether or not perceptions of dealers are related to using and dealing, the total population was

[24]Carey, pp. 68-69, 71, 73.

asked the following question: What was your concept of dealing before you became involved in marijuana? Table 8 depicts a comparison of the marijuana users with dealers in conceptions of marijuana dealing prior in involvement with marijuana in percentage.

The null hypothesis may be stated as follows. If $P \leq .02$ then reject null hypothesis in favor of a new hypothesis there is not a disparity in attitudes toward dealing prior to use of marijuana. The lack of disparity between the observed and the expected frequency is noteworthy. The observed positive response of users was 0, the expected was .05. The negative observed response of the user toward the dealer was 30. The expected was 28.5. The observed response of dealers toward dealers was 1, the expected was .46. The negative observed response of the dealers toward dealers was 29, the expected frequency was 26.6.

TABLE 9

Attitudes of Marijuana Dealers and Users Toward Stereotypes of Marijuana Dealers After Involvement with Marijuana

	Positive	Negative
User	4	24
Dealer	28	2

$X^2 = 32.2$ df = .1 $P \leq .001$

There will be no disparity between concepts of users and dealers as related to non-dealing.

$P \leq .001$ then reject the null hypothesis for the alternative hypothesis. There is a disparity of attitudes toward dealing between marijuana users and dealing. The observed positive response of users toward dealing was 4, the expected frequency was 16. The observed positive response of dealers was 28, the expected was 16. The observed negative response of users toward dealers was 24, the expected frequency was 14. The negative observed response of dealers was 2, the expected was 14. (Table 9).

The ability to acquire large amounts and the ability to sell them, are necessary but not sufficient for a user to become a dealer: he must change his concepts of the role of a dealer. The dealers were then asked what feelings they had about dealers before they started to smoke pot. Twenty-seven said they had negative views, and two said they had no feelings at all. One dealer responded positively. One dealer described it this way:

> I was really dumb about drugs. This guy came around to our school and showed us films about pot and heroin and how pushers were all trying to get you hooked on dope. I hadn't any way of knowing better so I had a really stereotyped attitude.

Another dealer described dealers in the following way:

> Well, he's the kind of guy who has his shit a little more together than the average person. He can handle the heat without being paranoid. He's got to have his head together or he won't be able to make it.

Twenty-eight dealers described dealers in that way. Two dealers described dealers as, "Most are people who didn't like to work and couldn't make much money honestly."

The marijuana users were asked to describe what stereotype they had of dealers before they began to smoke marijuana. They all replied much the same way as the dealers had—that they had stereotypes of sinister pushers who wanted to get them hooked. When asked what their feelings were now toward dealers, all but four responded negatively towards the personality of the people who were full-time dealers. The less involved the dealers are, the more positive were the users' expressed views toward the dealers. Thirty of the users expressed that they were glad that there were dealers, but would rather not have contact with them. One heavy user responded this way when asked his opinion of dealers:

> Don't get me wrong, I have some good friends who deal occasionally, and I have even sold a few lids to friends. But most real dealers are really flakey people who can't do anything else. I am not talking about the guy who sells a few pounds every once in a while, but most real dealers are lazy.

The dealers were asked what their stereotype was of dealers of marijuana now. Twenty-eight responded in a positive way, and two responded negatively. A typical answer from a middle range dealer was: "A dealer is able to handle pressure better, he generally got his shit together, if he hasn't he couldn't deal."

The users were then asked if they considered selling pot wrong. Two of the thirty said they felt it was wrong because they did not want to influence someone to try the drug, and if a person sold marijuana in large amounts, then he would be in it for the money and might have to hurt someone. The other twenty-eight users responded that it was not wrong to deal marijuana. The thirty users were asked if they considered breaking the laws against marijuana wrong. All thirty responded that they felt it was not wrong to break the law because the law was not protecting anyone. One user replied as follows:

> Who cares if I sit at home and get stoned or sell a few lids to friends? I don't hurt anybody, not even myself. It's sort of crazy to think that there are guys out there who would break my door down and haul me off to jail just over pot.

The response of the dealers toward dealers in a positive way and the response of users in a negative way shows that the dealers have changed their concept to fit the social

controls of their sub-group, whereas the users have altered their concept to a more rational view but still a negative view (refer to Table 9).

When the users were asked why they did not deal, there were several reasons that were universally expressed by all users. One user, a twenty-two-year-old college student, expressed himself in the following manner:

"Well, it's just too much hassle."

Interviewer: "What do you mean, too much hassle?"

Respondent: "Well, I got this friend over in Arlington who deals. It's really no fun to go to his place. Somebody's always calling, he has to run all over town half the time on bum trips. Man, it's bad enough trying to buy pot. Half the time, his deal falls through, much less buying and then having to resell it. People never have the money. You have to worry about the cops. It's just not worth it."

Interviewer: "What about the money?"

Respondent: "They make good money, but they pay for it. 'X' used to blow into town after a deal. He would really be loaded [have money]. He would blow it out, I mean really be a high roller for a few days, then he would really get down and depressed. He was sort of a manic depressive."

Another user, a twenty-one-year-old construction worker, when asked why he did not deal, replied:

> Scared. You have to be too careful. You have to be real careful of who you get to know. People will sell you out. This friend who deals is really paranoid. He goes nuts anytime he is around someone he doesn't know. He freaks out. But that's the way you got to be. Like there were some guys who lived down from some guys who lived down from some friends. They were real open with people and they got popped. I just couldn't live that way. I got too much to lose if I got popped.

The actual fear of arrest and the pressure that surrounds the lifestyle of a dealer were the reasons expressed by all thirty of the users for not dealing. The ability to stand up to pressure and handle fear of arrest were cited as positive points by the dealers about themselves.

The users, although most of them have legally been guilty of selling marijuana, did not take on the role of a dealer because of fear of arrest and the fear of sanctions from significant other. The user may have failed to neutralize the social controls of the larger society.

The user non-dealers when asked **if they had ever sold marijuana, and if so, why did they not continue**, replied that they were too paranoid, did not like a lot of people coming around asking for pot, and were afraid they would get busted. One twenty-four-year old law student replied:

> Sure, I've sold lids. I don't think you can find anybody who smokes very much who hasn't. I never did any dealing. I don't have the personality for it. I almost started to deal some lids when some friends got popped and that changed my mind. You can't deal unless you let people know, and I would just as soon no one know I even smoke, much less deal. It's too dangerous.

Table 10 illustrates the frequency of marijuana sales by users non-dealers.

TABLE 10

Frequency of Marijuana Sales by Users Non-Dealers

Had Sold		Had Not Sold	
N	%	N	%
24	80	6	20

The dealers were then asked **why they dealt**. All thirty dealers replied that the money was the main reason, although better access to drugs, travel and excitement were also mentioned. One dealer who is a full-time dealer, responded:

> "It is a challenge to try to get by. You are in a unique position. You can do something dishonest without feeling guilt and I enjoy the high-risk money."

Interviewer: "Do you feel any guilt about selling?"

Respondent: "Not about selling pot. Sometimes I feel guilty about not having a job or going to school, but I don't guess it bothers me too much.

Interviewer: "If it does bother you, why don't you do something else?"

Respondent: "It's too easy to do deals, and hanging out's a good time. Besides, I probably will settle down in a few years. There's no hurry."*

All thirty dealers were asked **if they saw a chance of getting caught**. All replied that there was a chance, but it was a small one. They also felt it was dependent on how they would be able to keep their cool. One twenty-four-year-old full-time dealer replied:

> "Not now, no. At first I did. Really, as long as you play it cool and keep you head there is not much chance."

Interviewer: "Then why is it that so many people get caught?"

Respondent: "Well, they screw up, they get greedy and sell to people they don't know, or they talk too much. Sometimes it's just dumb luck."

*See D. Glaser, Chapter II, **Adult Crime and Social Policy** for reference. Re: lifestyle and visibility in crime.

The next question asked was **what effect getting caught would have on the dealer's future**. One dealer answered in the following way:

Interviewer: "What effect would getting caught have on your future?
Respondent: "Well, it would be a hassle and cost me a lot of money."
Interviewer: "What about jail?"
Respondent: "No, there's not much chance of that. I would get a good lawyer and probably get off with probation at the worst."
Interviewer: "What effect would this have on your getting a job in the future?"
Respondent: "Not much. Really, I think it would probably be erased off my record in a few years anyway."
Interviewer: "If you were caught, would you continue?"
Respondent: "Dealing or smoking?"
Interviewer: "Both."
Respondent: "I don't ever plan to stop smoking, but I would probably stop dealing. For awhile, anyway."
Interviewer: "How would your family take it if you got caught?."
Respondent: "They wouldn't like it too much."

These were fairly typical answers. One dealer interviewed said that he would stop dealing in the event that he was caught. All thirty dealers saw little chance of ever getting caught and were reluctant to talk about the effects. Only seven dealers mentioned their families without the interviewer bringing the subject up. When asked about the effect of being arrested on the family, the dealers were concerned with the families' response toward the dealer himself, and not, as in the case of the users, what effect the arrest would actually have on the family.

The dealers were asked abut the paranoia that the non-dealers had mentioned. One twenty-two-year-old dealer responded as follows:

Interviewer: "**Do you ever get paranoid about people or about getting busted?**"
Respondent: "At first when I began to deal, I was real paranoid about everybody. I almost quit several times because of the pressure, but after awhile, I got used to it. As long as you are careful, there's nothing to worry about."

Another dealer replied:

> "Yeah, it's like when you first start smoking, you think everybody knows, but pretty soon you snap out and get your shit together. If you are going to get popped, there's nothing you can do about it. I really don't even like to be around anyone who is paranoid. They are likely to screw up. You got to keep your cool."

The dealers were asked **if they enjoyed selling pot, and if so, why.** Twenty-one of the dealers said that they enjoyed the whole transaction. Eight said that they enjoyed the benefits of the sales, such as travel and extra money. Seven of the eight were large dealers who made sales on a less personal and high risk level (see Table 11).

TABLE 11

Dealers' Perception of Enjoyment of Marijuana Dealing Related to Size of the Transaction

	Enjoy the Transaction	Enjoy Benefits Not Transaction
Large Dealers	1	7
Small Dealers	20	1
Total	21	8

2 x 2 Table df=1 $P \leq .001$ $X^2 = 19.4$

In order to test the relationship statistically, the null hypothesis may be stated that there are no differences between the large dealers of marijuana and the smaller dealers in regard to their enjoyment of the actual transaction of selling marijuana. Since the probability is at or below .001, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis that there is a difference between the perception of enjoyment of the marijuana transaction relating to the size of the marijuana transaction. The author found, through the interviews and observations, that the larger deals were conducted on a less personal basis and with a business attitude on the part of both buyer and dealer.

One twenty-three-year-old dealer responded this way:

Respondent: "Yeah, I dig being able to cop pounds. I guess it's knowing something that straight people don't."
Interviewer: "What about the paranoid?"
Respondent: "I don't mind that as it sort of makes it more fun. It's a test to see if you can keep your cool."

One of the seven larger dealers, who said he did not enjoy the actual transaction replied:

> "Well, there's too much pressure and waiting. If you could get rid of the pot without any hassle, that would be different, but usually there's some kind of hassle. I like to get it over with as fast as I can."

Interviewer: "Why do you do it if you don't enjoy it?"
Respondent: "The extra money, and I get to travel and live a freer lifestyle."

The dealers were then asked **if they had any real need to sell**. Three dealers answered that, "yes," they did have a need. One was a full-time dealer who fluctuated between selling pounds and lids. One was employed as a construction worker, and one was a student. They stated that they needed the money to live on. The twenty-seven dealers that said they could get by without it also said they needed the extra money. When asked what the money was used for, the twenty-seven dealers replied that they just spend it, mostly on entertainment, stereos, albums, and drugs. Only the three dealers who said they need to deal mentioned necessities.

Table 12 depicts the degree of necessity for a dealer to deal.

TABLE 12

Degree of Necessity for Dealer to Deal

No Need to Deal		Had a Need to Deal		Total	
N	%	N	%	N	%
27	90	3	10	30	100

The dealers were then asked **if they had a comparable means of making money with the same amount of effort**. Two dealers replied that they did not have a comparable means of making money (see Table 13). The dealers were then asked **if they could completely support themselves dealing marijuana** (Table 13).

Finally, the dealers were asked **what part dealing played in their social lives and if it gave them status within their peer group**. This was the only question that the answers given did not seem to represent the reality of the situation. The dealers responded that it had very little part in their social lives. However, the author's observations of the dealers at parties and in their homes indicated the opposite.

TABLE 13

Profits from Marijuana Dealing As Opposed to Conventional Work

Can Make More		Can Not Make More		Complete Self-Support		Couldn't Support Self	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
2	6.6	28	93.3	21	70	9	30

Dealing appears to play a large part in the dealers' social lives and the status that they hold within their peer group. The more the dealer was engulfed in his role, the more status he had within his peer group of users and dealers. This was examined in several ways which follow: (1) the dealers all took pride in the quality of marijuana that they kept for their personal supply, and (2) they were also proud of their ability to obtain marijuana in large amounts for lower prices.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has presented an analysis of the process of becoming a marijuana dealer. It is only through an understanding of this process that we will be able to understand the marijuana problem more completely.

Essentially, the process of becoming a dealer as observed in this study can be divided into a two-fold process: (1) the development of the external relationships which allow entrance into the marijuana-using groups; and (2) the rationalizing of the internal norms and goals of the larger society to those of a marijuana dealer.

The social controls of society that prohibit marijuana use are primarily the same that govern the sale of the drug. They are:

1. the limiting of supply and access to marijuana,
2. the necessity of keeping the out-group from becoming aware of what is going on, and
3. control through the act as immoral.

The degree that the user is able to normalize the controls seems to determine the degree of involvement that the user will have with marijuana dealing. The would-be dealer must meet people who have an access and are willing and able to provide marijuana in amounts that are sufficient for the user to have an excess past his own needs. These relationships expose the user to norms and values of marijuana dealing.

The entrance to marijuana-using groups and access to marijuana are necessary, but not sufficient to become a dealer. Most heavy users have sold marijuana, but do not do so in large amounts or for profit. Nor do they sell with regularity. For a user to become a dealer, he must also neutralize the norms of the larger society and replace them with the norms and values of marijuana dealing as follow:

1. He must associate himself with people who hold dealing in a positive light.
2. He must change his negative stereotype of a dealer to a positive one.
3. He must rationalize his fears of apprehension by the police.
4. He must rationalize that significant others will not find out or be affected by his dealing.

The inability to normalize any of these controls will retard his involvement in marijuana dealing. This process, then, may be viewed as an extension of the process which Becker notes in his work on marijuana use and social control.[25]

This study has described the process of becoming a marijuana dealer. There are several areas in which research could flow out from this study. All of the respondents in this study that were interviewed were white, middle-class males. (Several Mexican-Americans and several women were observed but not interviewed.) The process of becoming a dealer for a Black or Mexican-American, or persons coming from the lower socio-economic classes might be quite different from that of some of a middle-class background. For further consideration might be the effect of a police crack-down on the views of users toward dealing. Also, the effect of apprehension on marijuana dealers and whether they continue to deal could be explored. Researchers who plan to do studies of this nature would do well to take into consideration several factors. They are:

1. The researcher should use people from an area distant from where he resides. If by chance the respondent is apprehended by the police, the researcher and his study could be in jeopardy.
2. The researcher should, perhaps, pick respondents with whom he will be able to keep in touch until the study is completed in order to gather essential information which may have been missed in the first interview.

The effects of the laws prohibiting marijuana are far reaching and impossible to gauge. The purpose of this study was to outline the process of becoming a marijuana dealer. The importance of being able to outline the process of becoming a dealer is to give a better understanding of the marijuana problem in a holistic view. The marijuana problem for the Criminal Justice System can be divided into a two-fold argument: (1) that it is physically harmful; and (2) that marijuana is an affront to society values of work, authority, and responsibility. Neither of these arguments were the focus of research in this work. However, from the data presented it appears that all dealers and users were either striving for or expecting to become middle-class. The influence, then, is that middle-class values are held to some degree.

The effect of a felony arrest could very well block conventional routes to success. It would be interesting to know whether or not just what the effect would be upon the value structure of the individuals involved.

The focus of this study has been directed at the social processes that take place in the development of a marijuana dealer. The personality characteristics of the dealer in this study has not been considered for research purposes. The author is of the opinion that there could be a pre-disposition in the personality of the people who become marijuana dealers, but unless this potential is subjected to the process described, the potential will never be realized. (No data have been presented to support this view.) Persons who have not been involved and who may never be involved may have the same personality traits but have not become exposed to the process necessary to become a dealer. The question is moot for the moment.

---

[25] Becker, p. 78.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, Howard S. **The Other Side**. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

——. **Outsiders**. New York: The Free Press 1963.

Blum, Richard H. and Associates. **Drug Dealers - Taking Action**. San Francisco-Washington-London: The Jossey-Bass Behavioral Science Series, 1973.

——. **The Dream Sellers**. San Francisco-Washington-London: The Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.

——. **Society and Drugs, Drug I**. San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass Behavioral Science Series, 1970.

——. **Students and Drugs, Drugs II.** San Francisco: The Jossey-Bass Behavioral Science Series, 1970.

Carey, James T. **The College Drug Scene**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

The Consumer's Union Report on Narcotics, Stimulants, Depressants, Inhalants, Hallucinates and Marijuana, including Caffeine, Nicotine and Alcohol. **Licit and Illicit Drugs**, Edward M. Brecher and the Editors of **Consumer Reports**. Boston-Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Finlator, John. **The Drugged Nation: A "Narc's" Story**. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973.

Glaser, Barney G. and Strauss, Anselm L., **The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.** Chicago, Illinois: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Goode, Erich. **Marijuana**. Chicago-New York: Aldine-Atherton Publishers, 1969.

——. **The Marijuana Smokers**. New York-London: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

Grinspoon, Lester, M.D., **Marijuana Reconsidered**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Incorporated, 1971.

Lastrucci, Carlo L., **The Scientific Approach, Basic Principles of the Scientific Method**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1963-67.

Kaplan, John. **Marijuana—The New Prohibition**. New York: The World Publishing Company, June, 1970.

Robinson, W.S. "The Logical Structure of Analytic Induction," **American Sociological Review**, p. 812.

Schur, Edwin M. **Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications**. New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper and Row, 1971.

Sjobert, Gideon and Roger Nett. **A Methodology for Social Research.** New York, Evanston, and Longon: Harper and Row, 1968.

APPENDIX

Interview Questions

1. Will you consent to be interviewed?
2. Will you let me record our conversations?
3. What is your parent's income?
4. What is your occupation?
5. What education do you have?
6. What size amount do you deal?
7. How often do you smoke?
8. Is your parent's income equal to the income of your peer's parents?
9. Is money the reason you began to deal?
10. Would you have been able to make a large buy when you first began to smoke?
11. Why did you begin to sell in large amounts?
12. What was your attitude toward dealers before you became involved with marijuana?
13. How has it changed?
14. Do you consider selling pot wrong?
15. What is your stereotype of a dealer?
16. The users were asked, "Why don't you deal?"
17. Users were asked if they had ever sold marijuana.
18. If so, why they did not continue.
19. The dealers were asked why they dealt.
20. The dealers were asked if they saw a chance of being caught.
21. If caught, what effect would this have on the future?
22. What effect would it have on your family?
23. Do you ever get paranoid about people or about getting busted?
24. Do you enjoy selling pot? If so, why?
25. Do you have a need to sell?
26. Do you have comparable means of making money with the same amount of effort?
27. What part does dealing play in your social life?
28. Does it give you status?